WATER YEAR 2000 – NEAR-TERM MEASURES TO AVOID UNANTICIPATED FISHERY AND WATER SUPPLY CONFLICTS

PRIORITY	PARTICIPANT	TYPE OF MEASURE	PURPOSE[1]	WATER QUALITY[2]	AMOUNT OF WATER[3]	COST/AF[4]	TOTAL COST
Near-Term Measures to Increase Operational Flexibility							
1	US Bureau of Reclamation	Joint Point of Diversion	1,2,3,4	No Impact	30,000 AF	$15/AF	$450,000
2	Department of Water Resources	Increase Banks PP (500 cfs)	1,2,3,4	No Impact	70,000 – 90,000 AF	?/AF	?
3	Ops Group	Flexing the E/I Ratio	1,2,3,4	No Impact	?	?/AF	?
	Subtotal				**Up to 120,000 AF**	**$15-?/AF**	**?**
Near-Term Measures to Acquire Water and Lease Storage Which Provide Long-Term Benefits							
4	Vidler Water Company, Inc.	Lease of GW Storage Space	1,2,3,4	No Impact	48,600 AF[5]	$186/AF[6]	$9,039,600[7]
5	Vidler Water Company, Inc.	Water Acquisition	1,2,3,4	No Impact	6,300 AF	$270/AF	$1,701,000
5	Kern County Interests	Banked GW Purchase	1,2,3,4	No Impact	100,000 AF[8]	$220/AF	$22,000,000
	Subtotal				**154,900 AF**	**$186-$270/AF**	**$32,740,600**
Near-Term Measures to Reduce San Luis Reservoir Low-Point Problem							
6	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Source Shifting	1,2,3,4	No Impact	60,000 AF	$75/AF	$4,500,000
6	Kern County Interests	Source Shifting	1,2,3,4	No Impact	50,000 - 90,000 AF[9]	$75/AF[10]	$8,100,000
	Subtotal				**Up to 150,000 AF**	**$75/AF**	**$12,600,000**

[1] This column lists the purposes each measure could address as follows: 1 = measures that will help avoid unanticipated fishery and water supply conflicts; 2 = measures which could address the San Luis Reservoir low-point problem; 3 = measures which could help provide environmental benefits beyond existing requirements; and 4 = measures which could help offset water supply impacts associated with b(2) payback. **(MORE???)**

[2] All of the measures should benefit water quality in San Luis Reservoir. It is also anticipated that these actions would not impact Delta water quality.

[3] Actual water supplies available under these measures would be affected by hydrologic conditions and regulatory decisions, including DOI's (b)(2) Plan.

[4] All of these values are preliminary, subject to negotiation, and dependent upon hydrologic conditions.

[5] Assumes storing: 300 AF in January; 9,400 AF in February; 18,400 AF in March; and 20,500 AF in April, 2000. This amount could be less due to Vidler's ability to both utilize other Semitropic partners put capacity and provide in-lieu surface water supplies to farmers.

[6] Lease price would be $36/yr/AF of stored water. Recovery capacity would be a minimum of 25% of the total storage space leased. Energy expenses to recover water are $50/AF. In addition, Semitropic WD charges a $100/AF cycle fee.

[7] Cost does not include purchasing or wheeling water to Semitropic.

[8] The actual amount that could be made available in any single year would be dependent upon the amount of money paid up-front.

[9] Two options are available for reoperation (1) shift deliveries that would normally be made in July and August to the September through December period; and (2) pump groundwater that would be replaced over the next five years with Section 215 Friant water supplies. The amount of April to August 2000 demand that could be shifted to after August depends upon the SWP allocations. At about a 50% allocation, there probably is little, if any ability to shift demands. At a full allocation, about 50,000 – 90,000 AF could be shifted. The cost would be about $75-90/AF.

[10] Price would be $75/AF if the water is repaid this year. Price does not include the cost associated with acquiring and conveying payback water.